

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 28-77 remain pending in the present application. Claims 28, 38, 47, 55, 60, 69 and 73 are the only independent claims.

Each of the claims includes a limitation not shown by or made obvious in view of the prior art. For example, each claim now includes a limitation of an “object” wherein “the object includes an interface that exposes a same set of business functionalities and acceptable parameters to multiple services.” Support for this limitation can be found in the specification at, e.g., paragraph [0072].

Lawlor does not discuss such an object construct. Rather, all of Lawlor’s data transactions and structures are described in terms of signals at a network layer or below (e.g., packets, LED signals, text information). The “menu item” object identified in the Office Action at page 3, section 8, is a visual graphical user interface “object” that does not expose “a same set of business functionalities and acceptable parameters to multiple services.” Such a graphical object is typically defined as a bitmap or vector-based image and does not provide functionality to services such as application programs.

Similarly, Matthews is a “system for displaying a list of items in a control object on a display screen.” Matthews at col. 4, lines 32-33. Matthews’ control object is described as interacting with a service at col. 13, lines 44-48. “The control object 135 in which the list is displayed can be manipulated by the user via a remote control or other suitable interface mechanism to perform operations corresponding to the items in the control object and the subscriber service being utilized.” However, no details of the control object’s “interface” (if any) with the service are described, much less an “interface that exposes a same set of business functionalities and acceptable parameters to multiple services” as is recited by the present claims.

In Matthews’ the objects are visual. Matthews is a system that “addresses the requirements of limited display “real estate” for displaying control images” (col. 7, Lines 4-12) “by manipulating a directional control on a remote control unit to put a focus frame on an item completely displayed in the control object,” (col. 4, lines 43-51) and “to support a more readable presentation of the displayed items or objects . . . by shifting the list items displayed in the control object such that new items are displayed and old items are removed from the display.” (col. 14, lines 26-27).

Application No.: 09/863,704  
Filed: May 23, 2001  
Attorney Ref.: 100146-000410US

Applicant respectfully submits that the present claims are in condition for allowance and an early Notice of Allowance is earnestly sought. The undersigned may be contacted at the telephone number below at the Examiner's convenience if it would help in the prosecution of this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

TRELLIS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY  
LAW GROUP, PC

Date: August 21, 2007

By\_\_\_\_/Charles J. Kulas /\_\_\_\_\_  
Charles J. Kulas  
Reg. No. 35,809  
Telephone: 415/279-5098